

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 1-32 were pending at the time of the outstanding Office Action. Of these claims, claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 25, and 26 have been amended, and claims 2, 9, 16 and 22 have been cancelled. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Thus, claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-21 and 23-32 are now pending in the application.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrow et al. (hereinafter "Arrow") in view of Yamaguchi et al. (hereinafter "Yamaguchi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The instant invention deals with managing IPsec sessions in an IPsec setting server, such that authentication and security parameter setting occurs on a server rather than remote machines utilizing the network security protocol. Correspondingly, claim 1 recites a network comprising "an IPsec setting server apparatus, which manages IPsec settings of said IPsec processing apparatuses, wherein said IPsec setting server apparatus includes means for collectively managing policies of said IPsec to be applied between first and second IPsec processing apparatuses, and wherein **said IPsec setting server apparatus includes means for specifying policies** of said IPsec to be applied between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses **based upon contents of a request message for communication between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses** received from said first IPsec processing apparatus." (emphasis added) Claims 8, 15 and 21 recite analogous features.

The Examiner asserts that the VPN management station 160 of Arrow allegedly teaches the feature of an IPsec setting server apparatus. The configuration data for the VPN is also compared to the IPsec settings managed by the IPsec setting server apparatus. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Arrow of the VPN management station

specifying policies of IPsec to be applied between the IPsec processing apparatuses. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of the VPN management station 160 receiving or utilizing the contents of a request message for communication between the IPsec processing apparatuses. Rather, the Examiner relies upon the system manager to specify IPsec policies to be applied. Even with this reliance, there is still no teaching or suggestion that these policies are specified based upon request messages for communication between the apparatuses. Thus, Arrow fails to teach all of the features of the invention as claimed, specifically failing to teach a network “wherein said IPsec setting server apparatus includes means for specifying policies of said IPsec to be applied between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses based upon contents of a request message for communication between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses received from said first IPsec processing apparatus.”

Yamaguchi fails to make up for the deficiencies of Arrow as shown above. Yamaguchi also fails to teach a network “wherein said IPsec setting server apparatus includes means for specifying policies of said IPsec to be applied between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses based upon contents of a request message for communication between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses received from said first IPsec processing apparatus.” Yamaguchi states each apparatus maintains its own SA and SPDs (paragraph 0077). There is no teaching that there is a IPsec setting server that maintains these values, let alone an IPsec setting server apparatus that specifies IPsec policies to be applied between the apparatuses. Thus, even if the teachings of Yamaguchi were combined with those of Arrow, the features of the instant invention (an IPsec setting server apparatus with means for specifying policies) would be lacking.

As shown, neither Arrow nor Yamaguchi teaches or discloses all of the features of the independent claim, specifically failing to teach a network “wherein said IPsec setting server apparatus includes means for specifying policies of said IPsec to be applied between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses based upon contents of a request message for communication between said first and second IPsec processing apparatuses received from said first IPsec processing apparatus.” Thus, Arrow and Yamaguchi, either alone or in any combination thereof, would also fail to teach all of the limitations of the independent claims.

If this rejection is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where this feature is disclosed in either Arrow or Yamaguchi.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole. As mentioned above, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding the application, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are

needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 29, 2007

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

Ramya Ananthanarayanan
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 59,597